| Ī | |
|----|---|
| 1 | IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT |
| 2 | FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE AT KNOXVILLE, TENNESSEE |
| 3 |) |
| 4 | UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,)) |
| 5 | Government,) |
| 6 | vs.) Case No. 3:17-cr-82-2) |
| 7 | HEATHER ANN TUCCI-JARRAF,) |
| 8 | Defendant.)) |
| 9 | SENTENCING PROCEEDINGS |
| 10 | BEFORE THE HONORABLE THOMAS A. VARLAN |
| 11 | Tuesday, July 17th, 2018 2:08 p.m. to 4:53 p.m. |
| 12 | APPEARANCES: |
| 13 | ON BEHALF OF THE GOVERNMENT: |
| 14 | CYNTHIA F. DAVIDSON, ESQ. |
| 15 | ANN-MARIE SVOLTO, ESQ. U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE |
| 16 | OFFICE OF U.S. ATTORNEY 800 Market Street |
| 17 | Suite 211 Knoxville, TN 37902 |
| 18 | ON BEHALF OF THE DEFENDANT HEATHER ANN |
| 19 | TUCCI-JARRAF: (Appearing Pro Se) |
| 20 | FRANCIS L. LLOYD, JR., ESQ. (Elbow Counsel) LAW OFFICE OF FRANCIS L. LLOYD, JR. |
| 21 | 9111 Cross Park Drive Building D, Suite 200 |
| 22 | Knoxville, TN 37923 |
| 23 | REPORTED BY: |
| 24 | Teresa S. Grandchamp, RMR, CRR P.O. Box 1362 |
| 25 | Knoxville, Tennessee 37901 (865) 244-0454 |
| | |
| | |

THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: All rise. 1 2 United States District Court for the Eastern 3 District of Tennessee is again in session. The Honorable Thomas A. Varlan, Chief United States 4 5 District Judge, presiding. Please come to order and be seated. 6 7 THE COURT: Thank you. Good afternoon, 8 everyone. Let's call up the next case, please. 9 THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: Criminal Action 3:17-cr-82, United States of America versus Heather 02:08PM 10 11 Ann Tucci-Jarraf. 12 Ms. Cynthia Davidson and Anne Svolto are here on behalf of the government. 13 14 Is the government present and ready to 15 proceed? 16 MS. DAVIDSON: Yes, Your Honor. THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: Mr. Francis Lloyd is 17 18 here on behalf of the defendant. Is the defendant present and ready to 19 02:08PM 20 proceed? 21 MR. LLOYD: Present and ready. I'm, again, 22 elbow counsel. 23 THE COURT: Yeah, and we'll clar- -- I 24 think we should clarify that. 25 Ms. Tucci-Jarraf, you're representing

yourself. You continue to represent yourself in 1 this matter; is that correct? 2 3 THE DEFENDANT: I'm here as myself without 4 any prejudice. 5 Your Honor, do you want me to stand up 6 or --7 THE COURT: We're going to have you come to the podium in just a moment, but I just wanted to 8 9 clarify that. And, Mr. Lloyd, you're here as 02:09PM 10 11 Ms. Tucci-Jarraf's elbow-appointed counsel; correct? 12 MR. LLOYD: Yes, yes. And the defendant has a question about 13 14 the order of this proceeding, not having done it before. 15 16 THE COURT: And I'll -- okay. I'll explain that. 17 18 Why don't you come on up to the podium, Ms. Tucci-Jarraf. 19 02:09PM 20 The first thing we do is: We swear in 21 the defendant so that -- if you want to give 22 testimony or otherwise. So even though you're 23 representing yourself, we'll go ahead and stick with 24 that order. 25 So if you'll come up to the podium.

Just like when you took the witness stand during the 1 2 trial, you were sworn in. So come on up to the podium, and we'll begin by having you sworn in 3 since -- as the defendant in this case. 4 THE DEFENDANT: Is this -- I have just one 5 6 question of clarification. Is this also for the 7 argument period? THE COURT: This would not apply to --8 9 THE DEFENDANT: Am I the only one swearing in? I'm not testifying. 02:09PM 10 11 THE COURT: If anyone else testifies, they'd be sworn in. But I'm just asking you some of 12 13 these preliminary questions. So if you don't mind, we'll swear you 14 15 in, but it won't pertain to the arguments. 16 THE DEFENDANT: Without prejudice, we'll proceed. 17 18 THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: Would you raise your right hand? 19 02:10PM 20 Do you solemnly swear or affirm that 21 you will true answers make to all questions asked of 22 you at this time as you would unto God? If so, 23 please say I do. Maybe.

THE DEFENDANT: I'll originally agree, I

swear, to speak true, accurate and complete at all

24

1 times.

THE COURT: Thank you.

And, again, let me confirm that -- I think I asked you when you were at the table -- that you're -- you continue to represent yourself in this case. I mean, you don't have the -- you've declined the opportunity to be represented by counsel.

THE DEFENDANT: As a matter of legal -- for legal clarification, I am here as myself, speaking as myself, true, accurate and complete the entire time. I'm not representing myself. I'm here as myself speaking.

THE COURT: Okay. But, Mr. Lloyd, you have consented and he has continued in the role of what's referred to as elbow counsel.

THE DEFENDANT: He assists me solely with filings; more of an administrative proceeding.

MR. LLOYD: I will, Your Honor, have a specific objection to submit to the Court on behalf of the defendant.

THE COURT: That's fine.

MR. LLOYD: She has a specific argument.

THE COURT: If she would like you to present any objections or any other aspects of the sentencing, that's fine with the Court.

02:10PM 10

02:11PM 20

1 THE DEFENDANT: Any --2 THE COURT: Just as background, just so 3 everyone knows where we are, on February 1, 2018, the defendant was found guilty by a jury of Count 7 4 of the Indictment in this case charging the 5 6 defendant with conspiracy to commit money laundering 7 in violation of 18 United States Code § 1956(h). 8 And the question I want to ask you now, Ms. Tucci-Jarraf, is: Do you understand that by federal statute the offense described in Count 7 02:11PM 10 11 requires a sentence of up to 20 years' imprisonment, 12 up to three years' supervised release, a fine of up to \$500,000, and a mandatory \$100 special 13 14 assessment? Do you understand by statute that 15 that's the punishment that you potentially face as a 16 result of the jury's finding of guilt in this case as to you? 17 18 THE DEFENDANT: May I have one moment, 19 please. (A discussion was had between 20

02:12PM

23

24

25

21 the defendant and elbow 22 counsel off the record.)

THE DEFENDANT: Without waiving a standing notice, without waiving jurisdiction, as well as a lack of jurisdiction and lack of authority of

yourself, Thomas A. Varlan, Chief U.S. District
Court, or Ms. Cynthia Davidson, and all the other
parties that were described and identified in
Document 101, which I restate and incorporate by
reference, as if set forth in full, as well as
Document 102, again, restated, as if by reference
and incorporated by reference as set forth in full.

So with that said and with that stated for the record, I am aware of the statutory from the date of August 24th and onward and that that's what the prosecution has set forth, as well as yourself just now.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

Now, I'll explain for your benefit and those in the audience, who may not have been to a federal sentencing before, how we'll proceed today.

A Presentence Report has been prepared by the United States Probation Office pertaining to you, Ms. Tucci-Jarraf, as the defendant. The Court will begin with you to determine objections to that Presentence Report.

The Court will then turn to the government and allow the government to either address any objections the defendant may have or otherwise to address the Presentence Report, which,

02:13PM 10

02:13PM 20

among other things, calculates the advisory guideline range applicable to this case.

The Court will then rule on objections to the Presentence Report and determine whether to accept the Presentence Report.

So that's essentially the first part of the sentencing.

The Second part of the sentencing is:
The Court would allow counsel for the government and then typically counsel for defendant, but in this case, you, Ms. Tucci-Jarraf, yourself, to address essentially what are referred to as the 18 United States Code § 3553 sentencing factors; in other words, to present argument to the Court as to the sentencing factors or other facts the Court should consider in its determination of an appropriate sentence in this case.

So that's the second part addressing the sentencing factors.

The third part would be, even though you, I anticipate, perhaps, might wish to present argument on your own behalf with respect to what those sentencing factors are, I'm dividing argument from what's referred to as allocution, which is the third phase of the sentencing.

02:14PM 10

02:14PM

argument from counsel as to the sentencing factors and in this case yourself and not counsel, unless you so desire your elbow counsel to make any argument, then the Court allows the defendant to allocute, make an allocution; in other words, to say anything the defendant wants to to the Court relevant to the issue of sentencing before the Court makes its sentencing determination.

So those are the three things we'll do.

And, also, typically, with respect -going back to, I guess, the second phase, which is
allowing counsel for the parties or, in this case,
the defendant herself to address the sentencing
factors and to make argument to the Court as to
sentencing, if there are any witnesses that either
side wishes to present, then that would be an
appropriate time to present those witnesses, again,
relevant to the matter of sentencing.

We're not here today to determine guilt as to Count 7 of the Indictment. That was the role of the jury and the jury has already made that determination. So that's not a determination for the Court today.

The determination for the Court is, is

02:15PM 10

02:16PM 20

what an appropriate sentence should be, or, in other words, to listen to everything within the parameters of what the Court has just discussed and then to -- the Court's role is then to impose a sentence sufficient, but not greater than necessary, to comply with the purposes discussed in 18 United States Code § 3553.

So, with that background in mind, we'll begin with the Presentence Report.

And the Court would note, just as a background, that the Revised Presentence Report agreed with a contention or objection of the government with respect to whether there should be an enhancement for -- under Sentencing Guideline §3B1.3 for abuse of position of trust or use of a special skill, and the probation officer agreed with the government's position in the addendum, and the Revised Presentence Report reflects this enhancement.

And the Court would note for the record that after the government filed its objection to the Presentence Report, the defendant filed a document, Document 198, in which it stated the defendant had a, quote, "due rejection for due cause," close quote, of the government's objection to the

02:16PM 10

02:17PM 20

Presentence Report.

And the Court -- and that may be what Mr. Lloyd is planning to address, but the Court is going to construe that filing as an objection by the defendant to the Revised Presentence Report, specifically with respect to the enhancement under Sentencing Guideline §3B1.3.

The defendant also previously in

Document 197 filed what she styled a due rejection

of the Presentence Report itself, but we'll probably

construe that as a continued objection to the

Court's jurisdiction, which the Court has already

ruled upon. But we'll see if there is anything else

to present in that regard.

So that's how the Court's interpreting the defendant's filings, but certainly the defendant or elbow counsel is to -- is free to address those objections and how the Court should address those objections.

So, do you want to go first,

Ms. Tucci-Jarraf, based on what Mr. Lloyd said
earlier, or, Mr. Lloyd, do you want to go first?

THE DEFENDANT: I'd like to make a

preliminary statement before we move forward on the objections.

02:18PM 10

02:18PM 20

THE COURT: Go ahead. 1 2 THE DEFENDANT: Anything that I present 3 versus anything that Mr. Lloyd presents, any time that Mr. Lloyd presents, it's not waiving my 4 5 challenge and my declaration that this Court, as well as the United States, has no jurisdiction or 6 7 authority over myself and that the record is still void. 8 9 So, Document 101 and 102 are still standing, as well as documents -- if you might give 02:19PM 10 11 me just a second so I can pull the document 12 reference. Some of them are standing and some of 13 14 them at this point I'll have to just orally make 15 them standing and then file the appropriate 16 paperwork. 17 So, 101 -- excuse me -- Document 18, 18 Document 101, Document 102. 19 Excuse me. (A discussion was had between 02:20PM 20 21 the defendant and elbow 22 counsel off the record.) 23 THE DEFENDANT: I apologize. This is going 24 the opposite direction than I'm used to. 25

(A discussion was had between 1 2 the defendant and elbow counsel off the record.) 3 4 THE DEFENDANT: I appreciate everyone's patience. The document doesn't have all the 5 6 documents in it. 7 MR. LLOYD: Your Honor, if I --MS. DAVIDSON: I have the docket sheet if 8 9 you want to take a look at that. 02:21PM 10 THE DEFENDANT: Sure. 11 MR. LLOYD: If I might be of help, Your 12 Honor, I believe that what the defendant wishes to do is to preserve any and all previously-filed 13 14 reservations and objections and challenges, whether it's to jurisdiction or any other item in the 15 prosecution of this case. 16 17 THE DEFENDANT: And for a correction, just 18 any precipes that you --THE COURT: I don't mean to interrupt, but 19 02:22PM 20 I guess what Mr. Lloyd is saying, and as I 21 understand, just so you understand, 22 Ms. Tucci-Jarraf, you were citing specific 23 documents, and the Court recalls those document numbers and has reviewed them, but he's basically 24 25 saying anything you have filed related to your

objections to the jurisdiction of the Court and 1 related matters, asking the Court to again take 2 those matters into consideration. 3 Is that essentially what you're saying, 4 5 Mr. Lloyd? 6 MR. LLOYD: That, Your Honor, and that 7 anything that I might state on behalf of the defendant does not constitute a waiver of any rights 8 9 reserved. THE COURT: All right. With that in mind, 02:22PM 10 11 Ms. Tucci-Jarraf, anything else? 12 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. Just with the cease and desist order, as well as -- oh, here we go. 13 14 I apologize. Document 147 15 specifically, and Document 148, Document 149, 16 Document 150, and Document 151 are all orally-made standing documents. 17 18 Thank you. And I'll file something in the record 19 02:23PM 20 in written form according to that oral. 21 THE COURT: All right. Thank you. 22 Mr. Lloyd, do you want to go next? 23 (A discussion was had between the defendant and elbow 24 25 counsel off the record.)

MR. LLOYD: Your Honor, I -- with that caveat, I'd like to state on behalf of

Ms. Tucci-Jarraf the specific -- I guess I'll use the word objection to the two-level enhancement that the probation officer has recommended under §3B1.3 of the United States Sentencing Guidelines.

The basis, the asserted basis presented by the prosecution for that increase in the -- or addition to the original offense level is based in the language of the section of the guidelines on abuse of a position of public or private trust or use of a special skill.

Understanding that Your Honor must make any decision concerning the offered enhancement and any objection to it on the basis of the jury's verdict in the case and all the evidence presented at trial, I respectfully submit that there is no such abuse of a position or private trust or use of a special skill in this case in the way contemplated by §3B1.3.

A sort of prime example of what 3B1.3 is about is the Bernie Madoff case in which Mr. Madoff did indeed, to accomplish -- well, to accomplish for a while his pyramid scheme, he abused clients who depended on him.

02:25PM 10

02:25PM 20

presented a point of view that the jury chose not to accept. But to the extent, Your Honor, it was presented first to people in the lending business and people in the motor vehicle sales business,

Ms. Tucci-Jarraf did not stand in a position of public or private trust and was not using a specific skill in the sense that in any transaction involving two or more parties, one cannot rely on a lawyer retained by the other side.

Ms. Tucci-Jarraf throughout the trial

To the extent the jury credited the view that the lending bank and the vendor of the motor vehicle relied on representations of

Ms. Tucci-Jarraf's status as a person with a law degree, it was inappropriate for them so to rely.

Whatever the jury found that this defendant might have misrepresented, there was never throughout the trial evidence any indication that the relationship of attorney and counselor on one side and client on the other was established with respect to any lending institution or with respect to the vendor of the motor vehicle.

It's taken me a while, frankly, Your

Honor, to come up with an example that might explain

my argument, and one occurred to me today that I

02:27PM

02:28PM 20

submit is on point, understanding that Your Honor might decide it's not a very good example, as is your prerogative.

If I were the lawyer involved for client A in a transaction and I have client A show up to a closing with a check drawn on the Bank of Yugoslavia, and I then tried to convince party B that there still is a Bank of Yugoslavia and it still has deposits and it still pays checks, party B would be foolish, at best, to accept anything but its own counselor's advice with respect to accept a Yugoslavian bank check.

I might not even be involved in -- involved with a specific intent to defraud. I might feel very strongly that the partition of what was Yugoslavia and the elimination of the Bank of Yugoslavia was a travesty and ought not to be recognized.

Whether I have a specific intent to defraud or whether I'm just -- just flat wrong about that little bit of international law, the application of this section of the Sentencing Guidelines in a subsequent criminal case would add to my potential, my advisory guideline sentence or term of imprisonment on the basis of that

02:29PM 10

02:30РМ 20

representation even if it was clearly bone-headed, to use a non-legal phrase, for party B to accept my representation that a Bank of Yugoslavia check is going to get cashed somewhere.

Put simply, Your Honor, I believe that the proffered enhancement with respect to the offense level on the basis of 3B1.3 is not justified by its own language because -- at least in the context of a person with a law degree, because such a person, whether practicing law appropriately or not, cannot have for a client the other party to the challenged transaction.

For that reason I've stated for Ms. Tucci-Jarraf that specific objection to that specific increase in the offense level.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

Why don't we let the government respond both to the specific and general objections as appropriate.

MS. DAVIDSON: Your Honor, with regard to the abuse of position or use of special skill, position of trust or use of special skill, in this case we are specifically dealing with the use of a special skill.

I don't think that there is any

02:32PM 10

02:32PM 20

question in part one of this enhancement that the defendant did have a special skill, and that was her legal training, and for a time she was, in fact, a practicing lawyer and was licensed, and whether or not that special skill facilitated the crime, I think the proof is fairly clear in this case, and I believe that's why probation agreed with us.

If you look at her action and the facts of this case, let's just start, first of all, with her co-defendant. She was charged with a conspiracy with the co-defendant being clearly relied upon her -- her purporting to be his lawyer of the trust in order to embolden him and to assist in the money laundering.

She -- specifically to commit the crime and his initial crime where he bought the CDs, which she was not charged with, but he relied on her, and he testified that he relied on her every step of the way, and he was talking to her via Skype when he was purchasing these CDs.

And then specifically with regard to the money laundering, she -- an employee of Whitney Bank testified that since Mr. Beane had legal counsel, it gave Mr. Beane's assertions of entitlement to that money authority.

02:33PM 10

02:34PM 20

And she said multiple times during that call she represented herself to be Mr. Beane's lawyer and she tried to make some distinction that she said she didn't say attorney, but she continued to make those assertions. And the employee at Whitney Bank said that it did go into her consideration as to whether or not to rescind the Fedwire.

She prepared trust documents that she gave to Buddy Gregg, and in those trust documents, she signed as lawyer for the trust.

And the employee from Buddy Gregg also testified that he relied on these trust documents to believe that the money had come from a trust and that Mr. Beane was entitled to the RV, which was, you know, in essence, the large section of the money laundering.

She specifically advised Beane and, if you remember, the employee from Ted Russell Ford that the transaction on the Ford truck should be Fedwire, and she knew that based -- as she testified, because of her training in the law and her experience in financial situations.

So she tried to perpetuate the money laundering by getting Ted Russell money to be done

02:34PM 10

02:35PM 20

as a Fedwire as opposed to the ACH transaction which she had normally done or the check that he wrote.

She used -- I mean, I have never heard of this that the bank and Ted Russell Ford shouldn't have relied on the advice in order to somehow foreclose the fact that she used it.

I mean, the -- the enhancement says if it significantly facilitated the commission of the crime. It facilitated it with her co-defendant, Mr. Beane. It certainly facilitated the crime with regard to Whitney Bank, and the employee of Whitney Bank testified as to that.

It specifically facilitated the crime with regard to Buddy Gregg and the trust documents that she prepared, and Ted Russell Ford, also.

Now, that crime was stopped based on the fact that USAA Bank discovered the fraud at that point, but she continued to try to assist in the commission of money laundering with co-defendant Beane, and we believe that the enhancement is appropriate.

Otherwise, with regard to the general objection of the PSR, we believe that the PSR is accurate. The amended PSR is accurate and should be adopted by this Court.

02:36PM 10

02:37PM

1 THE COURT: Thank you. MR. LLOYD: Your Honor, Ms. Tucci-Jarraf 2 3 has not had an opportunity yet to address the rest of her objections or --4 MS. DAVIDSON: Well, if --5 6 THE DEFENDANT: I made a preliminary 7 standing statement before we started. I haven't responded to actually any objections. 8 9 THE COURT: All right. Anything else on the specific objection related to §3B1.3? 02:37PM 10 11 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. 12 THE COURT: I mean, Mr. Lloyd has been 13 handling that. Anything else on that from you, 14 Mr. Lloyd --MR. LLOYD: 15 No. THE COURT: -- in response to the 16 17 government? 18 All right. Now, what do you want to address, Ms. Tucci-Jarraf? 19 02:38PM 20 THE DEFENDANT: Do you want me to sit here 21 or --22 THE COURT: Just come up to the podium, if 23 you would, please. 24 THE DEFENDANT: Again, I'll just restate 25 the standing statements that I made before we

started.

And, secondly, as far as full responsibility, you have Cynthia Davidson trying to mislead this Court as to what was actually said during the trial, because the record is very clear that the transactions actually occurred prior to me even speaking with Whitney Bank or any of the others. A Fedwire had already been sent.

So we're getting into minutia detail here with what looks like or appears to be the hopes that people will not have accurate recall.

As far as the truck dealership, it was a dirty transaction. The dealership had given him the truck without even having payment and just said, "Oh, bring it on down later."

For me, that's not how things are supposed to work in commerce. You pay; you get the product. It's all done -- clean hands, clean transaction. Otherwise, people get in trouble. That's what was stated.

So as far as a full responsibility, that's why I even got involved was: You have a clear premeditative pattern with the Federal Reserve and using our Federal Bureau of Investigations, as well as our Department of Justice, as well as our

02:38PM 10

02:39РМ 20

judicial branch, which was also in the trial testimony and part of the record that we knew that there would be -- a guise of government acts would be used with the judicial surety to validate an unlawful and illegal process, such as Mr. Beane being arrested on July 11th, yet no warrants were actually issued until the 13th.

And for the RV, it wasn't even filed until the 18th, which was a backdated warrant for the RV seizure which we had discussed in the trial materials.

My law degree, the only thing that law school taught me, based on my experience, was: I was able to see the unlawful and illegal activities that do occur. That's it. And to be able to go in and correct them.

But it wasn't just me that went in to correct these, and that's what we were actually doing right now is: When you have proceedings that are allegedly on behalf of the United States, and, like we said, we already knew from past behavior of the Federal Reserve that they would utilize the Department of Justice and the Federal Bureau of Investigations.

We're seeing it play out in D.C. right

02:40PM 10

02:40PM 20

now, as far as the corruption that are in those.

And McCabe and Strauss, their unit was the one that came to D.C. to come get me, and as was testimony inside of the -- in the trial that was done was that they -- you had Janet Yellen, Chairman of the Federal Reserve, meeting with Alexander -- or excuse me -- Lamar Alexander, the Tennessee senator, as well as U.S. Treasury. While we had Parker Still from the FBI gaining advice and how to proceed from H- -- excuse me -- headquarters of FBI, which we heard testimony in the trial that it was headquarters in Washington, D.C., along with the Federal Reserve from Sean O'Malley that Tennessee would handle it.

02:42PM

02:41PM

So when you see -- when you see proceedings alleged on behalf of the United States when the United States does not have power to act, it becomes personal. The personal actions done with the full responsibility of the person doing it, accountability and liability.

So the Federal Reserve, the FBI, the DOJ have put you in the position sitting here now operating on your full responsibility, your full accountability and your full liability, as well as Cynthia Davidson's in the same spot, as well as all

the members of the FBI, including Parker Still.

So as far as any enhancement, only because of my law training was I able to see the unlawful and illegal activity that was being done by the Federal Reserve and their abuse of our branches, our departments, our bureaus, and our agencies, and a government that's supposed to serve and protect the people.

So when we have those that are delegated the duty to enforce laws but cannot follow the laws themselves, who is supposed to stand up?
Who is supposed to report that his own assets were commandeered from him or to report that the Federal Reserve was actually blocking him at that time?

So she would like to hold me responsible, and, actually, I was the main target of this whole thing with the Federal Reserve, this whole operation, which is why I put myself in.

But, then again, people who do not have the full acumen and consciousness of how the Federal Reserve and how banking actually works would not be able to identify.

So the only thing my law degree -- actually, it was all my experience that allowed me to step in and do what we've done in this whole case

02:42PM 10

02:43PM 20

with this record, as well as the accompanying case for the RV seizure. My law degree only taught me how to actually do the fraud in the first place.

So any kind of enhancement, I agree that people with a position of trust -- and that's what I'm saying is: You have FBI and DOJ that are in a position of trust that the people can't even go to to report who actually is committing crimes and have them deal with it.

And it's a problem we've had with the Federal Reserve and the banking system for a very long time, and you're actually seeing it all play out.

You're also seeing the collusion and the subversion and the subrogation that they do to the American people, such as Mr. Randall Keith Beane and myself, Heather Ann Tucci-Jarraf.

Miss Davidson, anything in a final response?

THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

MS. DAVIDSON: Yes, just briefly, Your Honor.

And I want to correct the record. When I was referring to Whitney Bank, the defendant is correct that the Fedwire had already transferred.

02:44PM 10

02:44PM 20

But she was -- they were speaking to Whitney Bank because USAA had asked them to reverse the Fedwire. And so they were questioning whether or not to make a decision on whether or not to reverse the Fedwire, and Ms. Tucci-Jarraf acting as a lawyer was trying to convince them not to refund the Fedwire.

Thank you.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

Now, addressing the Presentence Report, first with regard to, I guess, what the Court would style as the defendant's filing of a rejection of the Presentence Report itself, specifically Document 197, as the Court stated earlier, it does not necessarily construe this filing as a specific objection, but, instead, as a continuing objection to the Court's jurisdiction and authority over this matter.

That, in essence, is what defendant argued again in court today referencing numerous previously-filed documents and statements by the defendant related to this issue.

The Court has previously ruled on this issue; that is, the jurisdiction and authority of the Court, both at trial and in previous written opinions, including Document 69, which accepted

02:45PM

02:45PM 20

Judge Shirley's report and recommendation,
Document 62.

And the Court reiterates again today its previous findings that the Court does, in fact, have jurisdiction over the federal criminal conviction at issue here today.

So the Court will reject or overrule the continuing objection to the authority and jurisdiction of this Court.

The Court also stated previously it construes the defendant's filing of due rejection of the government's objection to the original Presentence Report as an objection to the Revised Presentence Report; specifically an objection to the two-level enhancement for abuse of a position of trust or use of a special skill under Sentencing Guideline §3B1.3.

Specifically, §3B1.3 provides that if that defendant abused a position of public or private trust, or, again, as relevant here, based upon the parties' arguments, used a special skill in a manner that significantly facilitated the commission or concealment of the offense, increase by two levels.

Among other guidance is Application

02:46PM 10

02:47PM 20

Note 4 which provides -- and, again, the Court, quoting from Application Note 4, special skill refers to a skill not possessed by members of the general public and usually requiring substantial education, tradition -- excuse me -- substantial education, training or licensing. Examples would include pilots, lawyers, doctors, accountants, chemists, and demolition experts.

The Court, after due consideration of the arguments presented today and the filings of the parties, is going to deny this specific objection because the Court finds the objection is not adequately supported by law or fact and because the evidence at trial does support a finding that the defendant did use a special skill in a manner that significantly facilitated the commission or concealment of the offense thereby triggering the applicability of guideline §3B1.3.

I don't think there is any dispute the defendant possessed a special skill; that is, legal training and status as an attorney, and, again, the Court would further find, after consideration of the arguments today, including the arguments not only of her elbow counsel but of the defendant herself, and based further on the Court's own review and

02:48PM 10

02:48РМ 20

recollection of the trial testimony, that such 1 2 testimony does support a conclusion, again, that the defendant utilized her special skill in a manner 3 that significantly facilitated the commission or 4 concealment of the offense. 5 6 So the Court, again, for all those 7 reasons, will overrule the defendant's objection to this two-level enhancement under §3B1.3. 8 9 As a result -- well, before I go there, 02:49PM 10 let me ask the government: Has the government 11 received the Presentence Report in this case? 12 MS. DAVIDSON: Yes, Your Honor, we have. 13 THE COURT: Does the government have any 14 objections to the Presentence Report? 15 MS. DAVIDSON: No further objections. Only the one that we just addressed. 16 17 THE COURT: All right. And then the Court 18 finds that the Revised Presentence Report does correctly calculate the offense level in this case. 19 02:50PM 20 And specifically, as noted in paragraph 21 62 of that report, based on a total offense level of 24 and criminal history category of I, the guideline 22 23 imprisonment range is 51 months to 63 months. 24 All right. We turn now to imposition

of sentence, and the Court would turn to the

government first. 1 Is there anything -- well, let me back 2 3 up. Are there any witnesses that either 4 5 side wishes to present related to the matter of 6 sentencing? I think the government had already said 7 no. 8 MS. DAVIDSON: Your Honor, we have no 9 witnesses. THE COURT: All right. Ms. Tucci-Jarraf, 02:50PM 10 11 do you have any witnesses you want to present 12 related to sentencing or the sentencing factors applicable to the Court? 13 14 THE DEFENDANT: If I might have one second. 15 THE COURT: And I'm not talking about your 16 allocution here. It's any witnesses besides 17 yourself. (A discussion was had between 18 the defendant and elbow 19 counsel off the record.) 02:51PM 20 21 THE DEFENDANT: Mr. Lloyd just informed me 22 that there are two. We have Youssef Jarraf and 23 William Ferguson. 24 THE COURT: All right. Do you want 25 them -- each of them to testify related to

sentencing? Now, we're not here to discuss quilt or 1 innocence; we're here to talk about what the 2 appropriate sentence should be. 3 THE DEFENDANT: Right. And I believe 4 Youssef Jarraf for sure towards sentencing, as well 5 6 as character by sentencing as well. 7 THE COURT: All right. Who do you want to 8 call first? 9 THE DEFENDANT: Can I just confirm with Mr. Lloyd, Your Honor? 02:51PM 10 11 THE COURT: Go ahead. 12 (A discussion was had between the defendant and elbow 13 14 counsel off the record.) 15 THE COURT: Do you wish to call --16 THE DEFENDANT: I've confirmed that the two witnesses do want to speak. 17 THE COURT: Okay. 18 THE DEFENDANT: And I believe it's going to 19 02:52PM 20 be a mix between sentencing and character. So how 21 do you want to deal with that? 22 THE COURT: Well, I mean, I think that all 23 relates to sentencing. So that's fine. You can 24 either ask them questions or you can just ask them 25 to make a statement. Either one is fine with the

Court. So we'll call them up. 1 2 Who do you want to go first? 3 Mr. Jarraf? THE DEFENDANT: Who wants to go first? 4 5 Okay. So William Ferguson will be 6 going first. 7 And before we do these testimonies, just that they will probably be making a blanket 8 9 statement. I might have questions whether -- after they make the blanket statement. 02:52PM 10 11 THE COURT: That would be fine. And also just keep in mind the government would have the 12 13 opportunity to ask questions as well. 14 So, Mr. Ferguson, if you'll come on up, 15 please. 16 THE DEFENDANT: They're being called without any -- the standing jurisdiction and 17 18 authority issue. THE COURT: Mr. Ferguson, if you'll just 19 02:53PM 20 follow the courtroom deputy, she will get you 21 situated. 22 THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: Do you solemnly 23 swear or affirm that you will true answers make to 24 all questions asked of you at this time as you would 25 unto God? If so, please say I do.

THE WITNESS: I do as original, true and 1 2 complete. 3 THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: Thank you. Have a 4 seat. 5 THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Ferguson. 6 Ms. Tucci-Jarraf or Mr. Lloyd, either 7 one, do you want to ask any questions or preliminary 8 questions, or do you just want Mr. Ferguson to make 9 a statement related to sentencing? MR. LLOYD: Your Honor, I might ask a few 02:53PM 10 11 to have him identify himself --12 THE COURT: That would be fine. MR. LLOYD: -- and the source of his 13 14 knowledge. 15 THE COURT: Go ahead. 16 WILLIAM THOMAS FERGUSON, III 17 having been first duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows: 18 19 EXAMINATION BY MR. LLOYD: 20 21 Q. Mr. Ferguson, would you -- have you already 22 stated your full name? I --23 THE COURT: He did. 24 BY THE WITNESS: 25 A. My name is William Thomas Ferguson, III.

BY MR. LLOYD:

- Q. And you -- you live where, sir?
- A. Currently I live in Portland, Oregon.
 - Q. You are a friend of Heather Tucci-Jarraf?
 - A. Yes, I am.
- Q. And would you please describe for the Court your estimation of her as a friend, as a person.
- A. I met Heather Ann Tucci-Jarraf in late

 2012. I was a blogger at the time, and I had

 uncovered a transaction, illegal transaction, from

 HSBC in Hong Kong to the New York -- Bank of New

 York for 39 trillion.

I published that. I got all kinds of death threats from lawyers and people in Hong Kong. And this was in October of 2012. I eventually pulled the video.

In late December, actually, the day after Christmas, Ms. Heather Ann Tucci-Jarraf e-mailed me, thanked me for publishing what I did, and said that she wanted to correct the energies that I was experiencing because she was concerned about the pressure I was under at the time. That was my introduction to the woman.

She has been the most kind human being I've ever known. Her concern, even in the midst of

02:54PM 10

02:55PM 20

this trial, and I was the one responsible for her in Oak Ridge for the housing, which I made the commitment to Judge Varlan or -- excuse me -- Judge Shirley at the time to make sure she was housed for those 10 months, or eight months, I guess it was.

But she -- in spite of all the false things that were stated in this Court, she always was concerned for even the prosecution, for the FBI, for the bigger picture, what's going on here, and what everyone is putting themselves in personal liability for. This is not a person who was out for her own fame.

I was in -- in the spring of 2013,

Ms. Tucci-Jarraf invited me to visit her home in

Morocco, me and several other bloggers at the time

who were publicizing her legal filings, and

that's when I met her and the rest of her family.

And all during that time she never took one dime from anybody. And so the characterizations of her in court as being Internet hungry, as being greedy are so out of character to what I know of this woman.

This woman has -- she shops at Goodwill when she needs to buy clothes. She -- she has done all of this on her own dime.

02:56PM 10

02:56PM 20

And even when this situation developed with Randy Beane, she didn't have to get involved in that, but she knew he was going to disappear down a black hole if she didn't.

And, you know, I -- this -- that's my -- my background with this. And it's -- it's been deeply saddening to watch this proceed. I can't change what the jury saw. But I also -- and I don't hold anything against Mr. Pack or the prosecution or the DOJ. I know they're just doing their jobs as they think they have to do it. But I know the jury wasn't fully informed what this case was about. This is in a criminal court when it should be a UCC issue, and I guess I'll stop there for a moment.

- Q. You understand that His Honor has before him today the question of what sentence to impose as a result of the earlier jury conviction.
 - A. Yes, I do.
- Q. And would you speak to your -- how you feel there should be punishment in this case based on your knowledge of and experience with Ms. Tucci-Jarraf.
- A. I don't think there has even been a crime here if you know the true facts about the Federal

02:57PM 10

02:58PM 20

Reserve. And I know Randy Beane did not use a false Social Security number. That was a concoction of USAA Bank to prove intent of fraud.

If he had used a false Social Security number, that would be fraud. But he didn't. And not one piece of evidence from the Federal Reserve as to the actual transaction logs from the Federal Reserve to USAA was ever shown. There was no transaction.

And I worked for Visa Bank- -- Visa Bankcard Company in San Francisco. We did ACH transactions there. And those things are logged with the Federal Reserve. There is logs.

Anybody can alter a Social Security number and an SQL database at USAA. You know, their own SQL expert can do that.

There was no evidence presented from the Federal Reserve itself. It's just USAA's word for it.

And then in testimony, I had -- you know, I watched Parker Still. And God bless the man. He's got a pure heart. He really believes what he's doing. But then we see a -- testimony from him saying that he got all this data from USAA.

And so I thought, well, maybe he did.

02:59PM 10

03:00PM 20

And then I see the Federal Reserve get up with Sean

O'Malley and -- I mean, Sean had it down. The guy

is -- he's got the gift of gab like an Irishman.

And I thought, well, he's good, until the

cross-examination, and then we learned where -- where

the information came from. You know, it came out of

the New York Fed.

Then it was fed to the FBI Cyber

Bureau. Then it was fed to the guy in -- at the

University of Tennessee on the cybercrime task force
who has a poli science degree. He's not even a

computer tech. So this guy is supposed to be this

technical expert on cybercrime, and all he's

got -- and I come from an IT background of almost

25 years and high-speed transaction processing with
the airlines, with the railroads, with the banks,
and they present a poli sci graduate to prove there

was a cybercrime that took place.

And in his testimony of this trail from the Federal Reserve to the -- to the University of Tennessee to Parker Still doesn't even match Parker Still's own testimony. And how the jury didn't -- missed it, I don't know. But I think maybe in the elocution of this evil woman, Heather Ann Tucci-Jarraf, who has a secret plan to get rich

03:01PM 10

22.01pm 20

03:01PM 20

quick on -- on a transaction, which is so absurd, it 1 2 boggles my mind. But whether this goes -- I mean, to my 3 mind, this should be dismissed now. But I'm not the 4 5 judge. I'm not the jury. I don't have a say in 6 whether she is guilty or free. 7 But I do know -- you know, I was -- I grew up a Christian, and I believe that, as I used 8 9 to say, truth will out; whether it's today or tomorrow, it will come out. 03:02PM 10 11 And this is the bravest woman I've ever met in my life. So that's -- that's the woman I 12 know. It wasn't the woman presented to this jury. 13 14 And, you know, I can't even imagine a 15 year in jail, let alone 51 months, for doing a trust document of all things. I mean -- but that's me. 16 17 Excuse me. My mouth is getting dry and 18 there is no water up here. But that -- I don't know if I answered 19 03:03PM 20 the question correctly or to your satisfaction. 21 Ο. You've answered the question. MR. LLOYD: And I believe Ms. Tucci-Jarraf 22 23 might have a few questions, Your Honor. 24 THE COURT: That's fine. Go ahead. 25 Do you have further questions of this

1 witness? From the podium, please. 2 3 THE DEFENDANT: You just like to hear the jingle; that's all. 4 5 EXAMINATION 6 BY THE DEFENDANT: 7 Okay. You stated that your background was Q. IT, and that's fine. It doesn't need to go into 8 9 that more because we're here for basically 03:04PM 10 sentencing. 11 Α. Uh-huh. 12 Okay. And you had stated that we first met when I had contacted you, and that was with two 13 14 others; correct? 15 Α. Yes. Q. With --16 Jenny Aromek (phonetic) and Brian Kelly. 17 18 And Brian Kelly. Q. And you were already doing blogs 19 03:04PM 20 regarding banker resignations. 21 Yes, I noticed a pattern starting in 22 February 2012 of a huge number of banking 23 resignations of high-level central bankers.

24

25

were just -- you know, HSBC, Deutsche Bank, all

these huge banks, and there was just an abnormally

large amount of them, and I started tracking them.

- Q. Uh-huh.
- A. And I think -- I lost count after about 15- -- I think it was about 1500 of them in a short period of time.

I knew somebody was out there, had filed something in law that was causing this exodus from banks so they were taking their golden parachutes. And I thought it was a man, but it was you. And that's what I found.

- Q. So as far as -- just to clarify, when he -- when Mr. Lloyd had asked you what kind of sentencing you think that I should get --
 - A. None. You've done nothing wrong.
- Q. And do you have any -- like a statement that you want to make, just without any interruptions with questions or anything like that that you want to make before you leave the stand?
- A. I think I pretty much covered it already, as far as my feeling about this trial. That doesn't mean that I hold any animus towards anyone in this court. I mean, that's just not my nature. And it's not, you know, what you or I would do.

We love everyone. This has always been about love and about showing the corruption that

03:05PM 10

03:05PM 20

existed in the banking system so it could be cleaned up.

And, you know, it's -- sometimes -- you know, sometimes things don't always go as we expect, and I don't know how this goes. I wish I did.

You know, history is full of Gandhis who were in jail for what they believed. Nelson Mandela for 26 years. I mean, it's been people like this all over the world, and things don't always go the way you want right away. But I know you, and what I saw portrayed in court was not you.

And, you know, I -- I know that the prosecution has their job and their job is to get cases -- convictions. So I -- I don't personalize this. It would have been anybody.

But -- but I -- I'm at a loss of words to express my frustration, perhaps, that I -- what more could -- could be said.

I mean, you were arrested by a British national in D.C., and if that doesn't say something about the FBI and what's foreign actors, I don't know what does.

I couldn't even find you for four days in D.C. The case was sealed. And the contact I did have from a business card turned out to be a

03:06PM 10

03:07PM 20

counterterrorism task force as if you were a 1 2 terrorist. But you would never harm anyone. So this whole thing has been insane 3 from the beginning. But, you know, we see how this 4 rolls. I don't -- I don't know how it rolls, but I 5 6 know you're innocent. I know Randy is innocent. 7 THE DEFENDANT: Thank you. THE COURT: All right. Thank you. Any 8 9 questions from the government? MS. DAVIDSON: No, Your Honor. 03:08PM 10 11 THE COURT: All right. Thank you, 12 Mr. Ferguson. You may return to the audience. 13 Mr. Lloyd or Ms. Tucci-Jarraf, did you 14 want to call Mr. Jarraf as a witness as well? 15 It looks like he's making his way up. 16 So --17 THE DEFENDANT: He's on his way up. 18 THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: Do you solemnly swear or affirm that you will true answers make to 19 02:10PM 20 all questions asked of you at this time as you would 21 unto God? If so, please say I do. 22 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I'm here to speak the 23 truth. 24 THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: Thank you. Have a 25 seat. Scoot as close as you can.

1 Please state and spell your name for 2 the record. 3 THE WITNESS: My name is Youssef Jarraf, spelled Y-o-u-s-s-e-f, Jarraf, J-a-r-r-a-f. 4 5 THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: Thank you, sir. 6 YOUSSEF JARRAF, 7 having been first duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows: 8 9 EXAMINATION BY MR. LLOYD: 03:09PM 10 11 Good afternoon, Mr. Jarraf. 12 Good afternoon. Α. Would you tell the Court, please, your 13 14 relationship with the defendant, Ms. Tucci-Jarraf. Yes. I am Heather Tucci-Jarraf's husband. 15 Α. 16 Do you and she have children? Q. We have four beautiful children. 17 Α. 18 What are their ages, please? Q. Zachary Jarraf is 16. Lela Jarraf is 15. 19 Α. 03:10PM 20 And Aleyah Jarraf, 12, and Adam, eight. 21 And I believe that you and the four Ο. 22 children reside currently in the Boston area? 23 Α. Yeah. Yes. I'm sorry. That's alright, sir. 24 Q. 25 Would you describe to the Court your

- 1 knowledge of Ms. Tucci-Jarraf. What kind of person 2 is she?
 - A. We met in the year 2000 in Italy. I was living in Florence.
 - Q. And, sir, I'm sorry, but I'm a little hard of hearing.
 - A. Hold on just a second, please.

THE WITNESS: Thank you.

BY THE WITNESS:

A. It's just that I never imagined this moment to be in front of my wife and she is about to be sentenced.

She is a wonderful woman. We met in 2000 in Italy. My life was in Italy. I grew up in Italy, and I was never thinking to leave Italy in my life. But for her, when we decided in 2003 she wanted to come back to the U.S., I give up everything. I followed her because she is a wonderful person.

We lived since then. We had our two beautiful kids here, because we had the two first in Italy and then the other two that were born here in Washington State. And she was always helping everybody, even the people that she didn't know.

She always -- she was genuine people.

03:11PM 10

03:12PM 20

You know, really kind. Really -- she never did anything for money. She always looked just for happiness. Happiness for everybody, not just for us.

And to see her today sitting accused that she is helping people to break the law, which she never did. She was very strict, correct since I knew her. Always.

People that know her in Italy or they know her in Morocco, they always -- they tell me, "You are lucky. You have a very kind woman, very beautiful-inside-heart woman." And it's not her that's supposed to be sitting there. It's wrong. This is wrong.

My kids yesterday when I was flying from Maine to come here, they were talking to me, "Bring mom back home. Don't come back without mom." It's so hard.

And all this just to make Federal
Reserve richer. You put innocent people in jail.
You leave four kids that are in need for her, that
are waiting for her. She never did nothing wrong.

I'm sorry.

BY MR. LLOYD:

Q. That's alright, sir. Take your time.

03:12PM 10

03:13PM 20

- I'm usually a strong character, strong 1 Α. 2 person, but, you know, I'm -- but I cannot -- I feel my tears coming because she doesn't deserve this. 3 It's wrong. It's switched upon my beliefs in 4 5 justice to see innocent people going to jail. 6 mean, this is wrong. It's wrong. I don't know what 7 to teach my kids, what to tell them about justice. Sir, if Ms. Tucci-Jarraf is ordered to a 8 Ο. 9 prison --03:14PM 10
 - Excuse me? Α.
 - Ο. If Ms. Tucci-Jarraf --

THE COURT: You have to speak over the microphone as well, Mr. Lloyd.

MR. LLOYD: I was wandering.

BY MR. LLOYD:

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

21

22

23

24

25

03:15PM 20

- If Ms. Tucci-Jarraf is sentenced to a term Ο. of imprisonment, is it your desire and your children's desire that she be housed as close to Boston as possible?
- Of course. We would like to see her often. Α. I mean, I'm hoping -- I was hoping to get her home today.
- Is there anything that you wish to say to the Court while His Honor has under consideration what sentence to impose in this case about what, in

your opinion, that sentence should be?

03:16PM

03:16PM

A. I mean, it wasn't even supposed to be a case from the beginning. And she -- she doesn't deserve any -- any of this. She doesn't deserve to be sitting there.

According to all the evidences that she tried to prove to the Court, which the jury ignores, she wasn't supposed to be in jail.

And we've been living for a year like a nightmare, just me as a single father with four little kids. It's hard for the kids, for me, for everybody.

So I will love to have her close to us, of course, in case if the -- if they will have to sentence her, I would love her to be.

MR. LLOYD: Your Honor, Ms. Tucci-Jarraf might have some questions.

THE COURT: Any questions, Ms. Tucci-Jarraf?

EXAMINATION

BY THE DEFENDANT:

- Q. We've known each other for 18 years.
- A. Uh-huh.
- Q. In that time, how long, per your knowledge, have I been working on the Federal Reserve and the corruption and all of that?

- A. I mean, maybe 12 years.
 - Q. 12 years where you were assisting --
- A. Yes.

03:18PM 20

03:17PM 10

- Q. -- and aware of details?
- A. Yeah.
 - Q. So when you tell this Court that I shouldn't be even sentenced, let alone the timing, or if I am to be sentenced, at the very least to be close to you guys, it's based on your experience with me over those 12 years --
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. -- of you knowing what was going on?
 - A. Yes, of course.
 - Q. Were there also years of my work that you weren't aware of what my job was?
 - A. Yes. You told me after. You told me that you were already doing that before even we met, before even we -- you were already working that they are not right, investigating and doing your researches about stuff that you don't feel right, that you don't feel correct, of the corruptions and --
 - Q. Do you have experience with dealing with corrupt systems?
 - A. Well, I am from Morocco. I see that in my

country.

When I move to Italy -- I grew up in Italy. I've seen that in Italy. That's everywhere. Corruption is everywhere. It's global, according to my experience. Places that I lived, that's what I lived. I've seen it. You can see it every day.

- Q. Have I ever utilized my experiences, or, to the best of your knowledge, have I ever utilized my experiences or my training or my expertise to harm anyone?
- A. No, never. That's what surprised me to see you here accused for something that all my life I've seen you not even asking for nothing. You've been doing -- helping people and doing a lot of folks even for free just to help, not to get or to gain something.
- Q. Did you know about this operation prior to it starting?
 - A. No, I didn't.
- Q. When did you find out about it? The operation to expose the corruption, when did you find out about the specific one involving Tennessee and the Federal Reserve and Randall Keith Beane?
- A. When the problems start when you got arrested.

03:19PM 10

03:19PM 20

- Q. In Washington, D.C.?
- A. In Washington, D.C.
- Q. Okay. Do you have any other further statements that you want to make to assist Mr. Varlan in making his decisions today?
- A. I want you to go home with us or arrange a house, arrange a room for us to move with you because, really, it would be -- to leave here without you, it was a nightmare for every single one, for my kids, for me every day. I can't see a life without. I can't see kids that are getting really sad without you. Every day -- they ask me about you every day. They tell me about their dreams that they had about you every day. It's -- it's killing them.
- Q. Ever since we have -- our oldest is 16.

 And even during all these 18 years, what has our family life been like? Has it been I'm not present or has it been tight-knit and we work and travel together, or what has it been like for everyone?
- A. We traveled a lot, but we always traveled as a family. We moved. We -- as any family, you have good time, bad time, but we always had good time. We always take care of the kids, give them the best education we could, best knowledge we have,

03:20PM 10

03:21PM 20

trying to give them international background that we 1 2 have. It was fun to live with you and the kids. So I would love to have you back. 3 Is there anything else that you want to say 4 5 before Ms. Davidson might have some questions for 6 you? 7 A. I just miss you a lot. That's not correct to see you there. And the real ones that are doing 8 all this mess, they are just getting richer and richer, stronger, powerful. They have to sacrifice 03:22PM 10 11 you, and by sacrificing you, it's also sacrificing me and the kids. It's tough. 12 13 THE DEFENDANT: Thank you. 14 BY THE WITNESS: The truth -- the truth will come -- sooner 15 Α. or later it will come out. 16 17 THE DEFENDANT: Thank you. I have nothing 18 more. THE COURT: Thank you. Any questions from 19 03:23PM 20 the government? 21 MS. DAVIDSON: No, Your Honor. 22 THE COURT: All right. Thank you, 23 Mr. Jarraf. You may go back to the audience.

I think that was all the witnesses the

defendant wished to present. So now let's go back

We'll begin with the government. 2 3 Anything the government would like to say or present at this time related to imposition of sentence? 4 5 MS. DAVIDSON: Yes, Your Honor. 6 MR. LLOYD: Your Honor --7 THE COURT: Excuse me a second. 8 MR. LLOYD: I'm sorry to interrupt, but Ms. Tucci-Jarraf asked whether she might have a short break. 03:23PM 10 11 THE COURT: Before the arguments? 12 MR. LLOYD: Yes, Your Honor. THE COURT: Sure. That's fine. Why don't 13 14 we go ahead and take a 10-minute recess. THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: All rise. 15 honorable court should stand in recess until 3:35. 16 17 (A brief recess was taken.) 18 THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: This honorable court is again in session. Please come to order and be 19 03:35PM 20 seated. 21 THE COURT: Thank you, everyone. Ms. Davidson. 22 23 MS. DAVIDSON: Just briefly, Your Honor. The United States relies on its sentencing 24 25 memorandum, but we would like to point out that the

to a discussion regarding sentencing.

government in this case asked for a sentence at the top of the guidelines of 63 months in this case.

And if you look at the 3553 factors, of primary importance -- obviously this is a serious crime, but as primary importance to the United States is the deterrence in this case, both general and specific deterrence.

You heard Mr. Ferguson testify that Ms. Tucci-Jarraf was not seeking fame, but, you know, his own testimony belies that.

She invited a group of bloggers to Morocco in the spring of 2013, bloggers, Internet bloggers. And so at every turn she has sought fame.

She continues to publish every pleading that has been filed in this court, including the PSR, which on the PSR it specifically has the Court-ordered -- the local rule to not publish the PSR, yet she chooses to ignore that.

She has consistently accused the United States and this Court of perpetuating a fraud on the United States. And this defendant and others that follow her should understand that to espouse these falsities could result in substantial jail time.

I mean, she did the crime. The jury heard 10 days, almost 10 days of proof, and came to

03:36PM 10

03:37РМ 20

the conclusion, which we assert is the correct conclusion, that she was guilty.

There was a victim in this case, USAA Bank. They had money stolen from them. There is not a vast conspiracy. This defendant is not a martyr.

We ask that she be sentenced to 63 months in prison, followed by a term of supervised release of three years.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

Ms. Tucci-Jarraf, if you'd like to address the Court as the defendant in this case, not your allocution, but if you would like to address the sentencing factors and/or imposition of sentence, the Court would allow you to do so at this time.

THE DEFENDANT: Okay. Since we took a break, without prejudice, I'll continue, and I reiterate, restate the statements, standing declarations that we made at the beginning.

I would like --

THE COURT: All right. Go ahead.

THE DEFENDANT: -- to ask for -- to be able to do my allocution first and to do the -- to address as far as what I think sentencing should be.

03:38PM 10

03:38PM 20

1 THE COURT: That's fine. Do you want to do 2 it at the same time? 3 THE DEFENDANT: That would be fine. THE COURT: All right. Why don't you come 4 5 up to the podium, and we'll just -- we'll allow 6 you -- we'll understand you're giving your 7 allocution, and then as part of that or as a corollary to that addressing the appropriate 8 9 sentence. So, go ahead. 03:39PM 10 THE DEFENDANT: Okay. (A discussion was had between 11 the defendant and elbow 12 counsel off the record.) 13 14 THE DEFENDANT: I just spoke with 15 Mr. Lloyd, and I believe he wanted to say something 16 in regards to the sentencing. So if he wants to do that first, and then I do my allocution and my --17 18 THE COURT: Go ahead. 19 THE DEFENDANT: Okay. Thank you. 03:39PM 20 MR. LLOYD: Your Honor, one thing that has 21 come out during this proceeding and during the trial 22 itself is that this is not a case, again, like the 23 Madoff case that I referred to earlier. 2.4 Whether supportable by logic in law or 25 not, there is plenty of evidence in this case to

illustrate that the view Ms. Tucci-Jarraf has, which is shared by others, that the Federal Reserve system is corrupt is -- is a view that is held sincerely.

The punishment sought by the United States in this case is, therefore, to some extent, the prosecution of a thought crime or an opinion crime.

The government has asked, Your Honor, to impose a sentence at the top end of the advisory guidelines range for deterrence, but part of the deterrence thought is in the nature of don't even think about promoting this notion of what the Federal Reserve does that is contrary to the accepted view of what the Federal Reserve does.

I urge the Court in applying the four factors to take that into account because I urge the Court to consider that -- that crossing the line into prosecution of a thought or an opinion about a system within the government of the United States is to cross a dangerous line. Conduct is punishable, but thought is not; opinion is not.

The other thing that I would urge the Court to consider is that pointing out that one uses digital media is not the same as seeking fame or seeking support for an opinion or argument. It's a

03:42PM

03:42PM 20

fact of life, Your Honor. I can assert that

personally. I was sort of dragged screaming and

kicking into using digital equipment. It's

unavoidable now.

I don't believe that it is fair to

impose a greater sentence than would otherwise be

applicable in this case on the basis of

That being said, Your Honor, I $\operatorname{\mathsf{I}}$ -- I yield the podium to the defendant.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Ms. Tucci-Jarraf's use of digital media.

Ms. Tucci-Jarraf.

THE DEFENDANT: Thank you. We proceed without prejudice as we stated before.

I'll be doing the allocution and what I believe sentencing should be mixed. Thank you.

So, Ms. Davidson has brought up factors to be considered in imposing a sentence, and I'm going to introduce my allocution in this way because factors to be considered in what I did and what has resulted in us being here today, I have used extreme prudence in judgment, as well as in action, and that's a matter of record, and what we have here is a case that does not have all the facts, does not have all the documents.

03:44PM 10

03:45PM 20

Ms. Davidson would have you believe, the United States, that I have a complete disregard or a significant or a healthy disregard for law, law enforcement, the judicial system, government in general. That has been basically the theme that has been touted from August 24th, if not before that during a Grand Jury indictment, at least from August 24th onward.

THE COURT: I'm going to ask you to scoot over a little bit there in front of the microphone there to make sure I can hear everything. Thank you.

THE DEFENDANT: I actually have a very healthy and loving relationship with systems, and that when they are created that they should serve the ones that created them.

Throughout this particular case, I have been ridiculed. I have been made fun of by

Ms. Davidson, as well as C. Clifford Shirley for essentially what is not just my beliefs but my experiences at the top levels of bank trade and finance globally, as well as in America.

The due declaration of lack of authority and jurisdiction, this was not something to upset everyone. It wasn't a matter of

03:46PM 10

03:46PM 20

make-believe or fabrication. This was actually the truth of the state of affairs that we are in today.

America was sold out a long time ago, and The Paradigm Report, which was a field report from the investigations that were done to be able to solve the pandemic of financial fraud globally, as well as in the United States -- and I apologize because I'm not sure. It was entered into trial. The Paradigm Report was actually entered into trial. And it goes through not just bank trade and finance and the financial system, but it also went through our judicial because it was piggybacked with judicial, because it's all interrelated, digital corruption as well as law enforcement corruption.

And then we had to take a look at subversion, collusion with foreign actors and our different branches of government.

This is 20 years of experience in my life and prudent application, prudent investigation in the course of actual titled jobs, as well as professional experience while I was a Bar attorney, but also while not being a Bar attorney of 2011 and onward.

That Paradigm Report was made available to a very few at the highest levels of bank trade

03:48PM 10

03:48PM 20

and finance, as well as institutionary investors, and that was done on March 6, 2011, and you can actually see in the markets the cause was not known at the time publicly, but you can actually see it and piece it together.

That Paradigm Report I restate and incorporate by reference as if set forth in full. It was a part of the trial. It was -- actually led to myself and members or individuals that worked inside the Department of Justice, as well as every different level of judicial; so from federal judges to state judges to district judges, municipal judges, as well as law enforcement, from sheriffs to FBI, marshals, CIA, NSA, and military.

And in their -- we've understood for a long time the Federal Reserve's acts are not anything secret, except for their procedures, their daily procedures; however, how the Federal Reserve actually came into existence and the deceptive acts and practices, as well as the selling out, we knew, no matter what the Federal Reserve does, it's -- that they would use government acts and hide under government acts using a judicial security -- excuse me -- surety to validate the process and the clerk's ledger.

03:49PM 10

03:50PM 20

In 2011, we had the -- let's just put it this way: Every single action that I took was working with our judicial, our executive and our legislative branch, and everything was made public the entire time that we were doing it so that we could revise it.

In 2011, the actual plan was made available. This would be Exhibit 1. It was a sworn affidavit. We were dealing with the Supreme Court. We utilized every single -- here we go.

It was put through that database.

Every single database in the United States, as well as globally, is utilized by the clean-up crews.

But this was from September 2011, and this actually had the plan of action that you are actually seeing played out, the finale part played out right now.

And in there you'll find the same statements. This is going to be an exhibit. So -- but basically you have the same statements.

Of course, it reflected the actual current legal and lawful status at that time. So the language in here would not be language that is accurate for the status legally, legal status and lawful status of today. However, statements like

03:50PM 10

03:51PM 20

pro government, I'm absolutely pro government,
absolutely anticorruption. All of that stands the
same.

In this particular affidavit, I was asked to list out basically the plan of how we would go around -- how would we expose the collusion, the foreign actors and their collusion and their use, their abuse of our particular branches of the United States, departments, agencies, and bureaus.

And this plan of action was put out in 2011, and this is what we have actually followed every single step of the way.

Why is that not showing? Okay.

Every single step of the way all involved from every branch of the United States government at the highest levels have had this information and they have actually been participating in the clean-up.

And if you go down to page 4 of 12, No. 16, the whole entire entirety of No. 16A through Z, and, actually, I believe it's A through AA, lists out the most important part was that there were actors operating -- and this is B -- within and abusing the people's government that have abused, usurped, committed other suffrage upon the people

03:52PM 10

03:53PM 20

destroying the very security of the people they swore to protect and uphold, reducing the people under absolute despotism, undeniably recorded in the public forum for all the world to evidence.

I bring this up because this is not just my belief, but this is actually recorded within the different departments, agencies inside of their bookkeeping.

And that the only way that we would be able to do this with keeping everyone safe, alive and making sure that it came out was that the actors within would be identified and that they would actually identify themselves to make it the most obvious as possible, which is what is happening and has been happening since last July.

There are actor's inability and unwillingness to follow, uphold or support the Constitutions herein identified and restated. We have absolute proof of that inside of the entire case where you had Randall Keith Beane unconstitutionally and unlawfully arrested. He wasn't even arrested; he was kidnapped without a warrant. It would be arresting, taking of his RV without a warrant. It would be grand larceny if it was conducted by anybody else.

03:54PM 10

03:54PM 20

However, according to Parker Still, he said that that was just the movies where they have to provide all that. There was no communication whatsoever. It was just a snab and grab.

And that the actors operating within these governments would be succinctly met -- excuse me -- sufficiently met by evidence of -- and it goes into the inability to uphold and support and follow the Constitution.

Misapplication -- No. 2, misapplication against the people of laws previously authorized by the people to be enacted solely for administration, governance, and efficiency of the people's governments, which would be your statutes and your codes and your regulations.

3, your actors acting outside of the authority granted to them by the people.

This case is and was for the purpose -- and I've always stated this -- was for the purpose of showing this particular flaw and the corrupt state.

No. 4, the actors causing the silence, termination, delay, or otherwise discrediting of the people's due consideration, investigation or determination of abuse, usurpation, and other

03:55PM 10

03:55РМ 20

suffrage that has already occurred, is occurring, or is yet to occur.

We're seeing that played out in D.C. as well. As I stated to everyone in this court, including to a jury, that the exposure of the FBI and the corruption in the FBI and how the FBI and the judicial are used by the Federal Reserve to be able to quell any of the people coming forward and being aware of the practices, deceptive acts and practices, unlawful and illegal practices of the Federal Reserve, using our branches.

Actors receiving -- No. 5, actors receiving or causing others to receive special interest or benefit that is not afforded to every one of the people.

Again, this case, we have special interests and/or benefit. We had Mr. Beane tell this particular court, as well as everyone else in the jury, he had had value that was stolen. But there was no FBI investigation there.

I'm pointing out that these are beliefs. We were acting on our beliefs to be able to protect our agencies and our bureaus and our departments and our branches to be able to do the job that we set out and created you for, and that

03:56PM 10

03:57PM 20

you, as personal -- in your personal actions -- typically they're considered government actions.

However, when there is no government authority and jurisdiction, they become your personal actions.

This was the plan. It has been the plan, and it has been followed to the T, was to get the actors that were abusing or the foreign agents that were placed inside of our own branches to get them to identify themselves by their own actions in such a way that was so obvious that even someone in a coma or possibly someone that still is under the belief that they are protecting and serving the people and yet facilitating theft, slavering systems would be able to see it.

So 16 of this -- and this will be entered into as an exhibit. This is from 2011.

That was the plan. It's been followed the entire time.

It was -- and as you can see now with the changing of -- I've never wavered with the changing of the laws, enactment of new executive orders.

So, for instance, on the anniversary date of Mr. Beane's -- Cynthia Davidson calls it arrest. I call it kidnapping, just based on the

03:58PM

03:58PM 20

facts and lack of warrant. On that day a couple days ago on the anniversary date the financial fraud enforcement task force was terminated. And instead now we have a market integrity and consumer fraud because that is basically what is happening is we have consumer fraud. We have a lack of integrity, not just market but also within our own government, and that's what we were cleaning up.

We had testimony from the Federal Reserve, Sean O'Malley, stating that they ordered the FBI to handle it, or that the FBI said that they would handle it, because he kept wavering on what his testimony was. He couldn't re- -- he would state that someone told him about the investigation and then later say that he contacted someone to tell them about the investigation, all the way to the OIG at this point.

So there was really never -- and you have USAA saying they were a victim and you have the Federal Reserve saying that they were a victim.

So this is the first time I've heard or during the report was that USAA found that they were a victim. However, even USAA states that the only one they held responsible for the -- for the money that they supposedly lost, which they didn't lose,

03:59PM 10

04:00PM

everything was recovered, was Randall Keith Beane.

However, even the facts there, if you have all the documentation, the alleged plaintiff is the United States. All of the records of the financial commandeering, as well as using people's value to finance the Federal Reserve system and its assets are done through the U.S. Treasury, which is a department and part of the executive branch.

That was all information that the
United States and Cynthia Davidson claimed but would
not swear or provide due documentation of a
representation to represent the United States, and
yet that is information that is within the United
States' coffers and yet wasn't provided to
Mr. Beane, nor myself, nor even the public.

These are the kinds of crimes that the public cannot go and report to a DOJ, to a Department of Justice, U.S. attorney, or the FBI, because, as you have seen how Ms. Davidson has treated anything that I have said during this entire -- since August 24th as ludicrous, crazy.

You had foreign actors, including those that are in the Federal Reserve system, place the whole of the United States, especially this judicial branch, its departments and its bureaus, under

04:01PM 10

04:01PM 20

trial -- excuse me -- under trial under this alleged Court's own record and first-hand actions. And yet the judicial branch at the highest levels knew about the plan in 2011 to expose the actors that were within or to get the actors to expose themselves, knowing that personal acts typically have always been done under the guise of government acts using a judicial surety to validate that process in the clerk's ledgers.

However, again, when there is no -when proceedings are allegedly on behalf of the
United States, the United States does not have power
to act. It's your personal actions.

And we discussed that on October 24th; again, in more depth, in more detail on October 18th, 2017. You were provided with what the actual law is, and the law was changed in 2000- -- after the 2011 findings and working with individuals that were in DOJ, inside of the judicial, inside of the FBI, and considering all factors and concerns that they brought, as far as what might be experienced in exposing the Federal Reserve and their abuse and enslaving human rights issues that were involved for their own personal safety that all guises and corporate veils were

04:02PM 10

04:03PM 20

disabled, dissolved and foreclosed and that protections were put into place.

Those protections were factualized trusts, not just for me, not just for Mr. Beane, but also for everyone in this room, everyone that was involved in this particular operation, because the point was only to expose it and then to correct it, to change it.

These are not just my beliefs, they're my experiences over 20 years of working to stop, solve, and make sure, to prohibit corruption from going -- whether it was in the banking industry or whether it was government. And that was not just here in the United States; it's all over. It was all intertwined.

Based on statements from Parker Still and other statements during the trial from the Federal Reserve, Sean O'Malley, you had basically an attachment of body, and we knew that this -- this has always been the pattern is: You have an attachment of body by a judicial, by force, threat of force, physical injury, physical restraint, or by use of threat or collusion through law or legal process which lawfully and legally cannot produce a lawful and legal jurisdiction or authority over

04:04PM 10

04:04PM 20

anyone.

And by dissolving, foreclosing and disabling all former guises and corporate veils, we were able to go forward and do this particular operation to expose the Federal Reserve, the corruption, and it was so that there would be a shift in consciousness and a shift in practices.

In this Court's own records, there is evidence of the intent to unlawfully and illegally manufacture jurisdiction authority over me and Randall Keith Beane by using deceptive acts and practices and the coercion of law or legal process in order to make an attachment of the bonding and then imprison it.

Ms. Davidson was consistently asking for my imprisonment since August 24th onwards. She got it twice. However, I'm here, like I stated, until we're done with all this.

And then coupled with Ms. Davidson and Ms. Svolto attempting to mislead -- I wouldn't say mislead. I would just say that it is their belief through their experience and their training that they presented other similarly-situated alleged judge's statements based on what they believe as well to validate their own statements, which is a

04:05PM 10

04:06PM 20

deceptive act and practice, now a matter of record, when you understand all the data and all the facts that are involved.

Inherent in our own judicial structure is the culminating and cultivating of human trafficking and human slavery via monitoring instruments through prison bonds, the kind of prison bonds that we're talking about, such as the underwriting, which actually goes to the Federal Reserve, which is known in this particular courtroom as a presentencing investigative report.

However, most people, unless they work in bank trade and finance, don't see those particular documents, don't see the transactions that go from your Clerk of Court, and this was all testimony inside of the -- that we did during the trial.

Those in the Federal Reserve system and from D.C. to Tennessee with clear and obvious premeditation by some individuals, ignorance by others, conspiracy, collusion, and subversion and other wrongful acts by many others, caused my body to be attached and then, again, unlawfully and illegally imprisoned twice.

The only time that I don't include or

04:07PM 10

04:07PM

don't count is when I authorized Clifford C. Shirley to be able to order the electronic monitoring.

I had been responsible during this entire operation. The operation was to stop an eminent threat to POTUS, which everyone laughed about, and now it's come out that there was a threat against POTUS months after the testimony that was given in trial.

That threat that existed was by members inside the Federal Reserve, as well as the foreign agents that run the 12 different foreign -- excuse me -- Federal Reserve banks, which are the same ones that were committing the corruption and collusion and the force and the coercion by law and legal process to the American people to stop people who do have the acumen and the knowledge and the experience to be able to expose corruption with inside of our systems.

Talk about a deterrence. They use the FBI, which has all come out. This was all part of the trial. O'Mal- -- Sean O'Malley admitted to it. You have members of the FBI. It's the University of Tennessee Police Department, a gentleman -- I don't remember his particular name -- who testified and said that he was assigned to the FBI cyber task

04:08PM 10

04:09PM 20

force, and that he identified it was New York FBI.

And then we had to go from New York FBI to the headquarters in Washington, D.C. where Parker Still received all of his advisement and how to proceed not just in D.C. but also here in Tennessee.

Federal Reserve has always thrown everyone under the bus. That's what they have done here in Tennessee. Nobody -- Cynthia always asked me what was so special about me. It wasn't about me. It was what was so special about Tennessee, Eastern District of Tennessee.

You had national security threats coming out of Oak Ridge. That was the military's choosing. Plus the experience with you, with Thomas Varlan, as well as my only requirement was whoever -- whatever state we picked that it would be -- they would make it the most obvious of what was going on.

I don't hold any grudge against anybody in this room. Everyone is operating on their point of reference and their knowledge. However, Document 18, which was restated and incorporated by reference as if set forth in full at the very beginning of this proceeding, that was the addendum of law. It also cancelled any and all presumptions.

04:10PM 10

12

11

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

04:10PM

20

22

21

23

24

Based on law, based on the challenge of jurisdiction and authority, it required a mandatory dismissal. But that's not what we had. We played it out. I didn't consent to any of it, but we played it out to make it visible so everyone could find where the flaws were, that we could correct them.

I don't -- at this point, you have

Ms. Davidson asking for what has been recommended in
the presentencing investigative report and is
relying on her memorandum.

I'm relying on everything that I gave to you and filed in this particular case. I'm incorporating all of those filings by reference as if set forth in full, and as far as proof and evidence pursuant to the 2011 plan that was set out, I submit and restate this entire case, Case No. 3:17-cr-82, as well as Case No. 117MJ-00531DARI, as well as Case No. -- for Tennessee -- 3:17-mj-1067 as evidence of the subversion and the collusion.

Now, my whole purpose of doing this particular case, this particular operation and working with everyone was not to have punishment, not to even do tribunals, even though everyone now has stood on tribunal by the Court's own record that

04:11PM 10

04:12PM 20

can be used in military tribunals. My point was to get everyone aware of what has been going on so that we can change it.

The documentation, if you had it, which the United States and its different branches, departments, agencies and bureaus have not set forth, they have not set forth that exculpatory evidence, which is: I have not committed any crime, that Randall Beef -- Beane -- excuse me -- Randall Keith Beane has not committed any crime, and that that evidence was not able to be put forth before this jury or before Thomas A. Varlan due to the actions and lack of actions by the United States and its various branches and departments, agencies and bureaus.

I do not consent to imprisoning based on those statements and based on the lack of evidence I just identified. I do not con- -- at this point you have Ms. Davidson essentially asking for Thomas A. Varlan, for this Court to validate their own unlawful and illegal actions.

You have the FBI hoping for you to validate and ensure, be the surety of their unlawful and illegal actions.

I'm asking for a change in behavior.

04:13PM 10

04:14PM 20

That has been my entire goal for 20 years.

Essentially at this point, based on all my statements I have just made, this Court's being put into a position -- actually, Thomas A. Varlan, because you're operating on your own personal responsibility, just as Cynthia Davidson and Anne-Marie Svolto and everyone else involved has been, including myself, personal actions are done with our full responsibility, accountability and liability is asking you to be that surety and engage in essentially what would account to a hostage situation, and I don't consent to being a hostage or held hostage.

I said this Court consider factors based on what has been going on, what has been said during the trial, which was discounted, as far as the FBI, the corruption inside the FBI, the statements that were made, and actually seeing it play out at this point where it's being uncovered, and it was all connected with the Federal Reserve.

I'm the one voice they don't want heard. I'm the one person that they don't want to assist others to assist themselves.

You're only as powerful as the rest of the people that are supposed to be the governing

04:15PM 10

04:15PM 20

body and the principals that put them in that place. When you have those that are duly delegated authority to enforce laws not even following their own laws, we have an issue. And there is more than enough proof in the public court of opinion, as well as on record, that that is the case here.

Truthfully, honestly, with -- I have four children. I have a husband. We spent 20 years -- most of my work I did without them even knowing what I was doing. A lot of the work required undercover, as far as prosecutor in the judicial early on. So, as a public defender, as a prosecutor so that I understood what the machinations were so I understood how our systems were abused.

Not once did I take advantage of any of that information. Not once did I do anything to harm -- in fact, I want to protect everyone in this particular case, including yourselves.

That's what those filings are. So no matter how much you want to make fun of them, that was what protects everyone from the Federal Reserve using judicial and legal process and coercion against any of you in this particular instance as we went in to do the exposés and also to make the

04:16PM 10

04:17PM 20

changes.

That includes any kind of claim that could have been made or used for treason. DOJ. You have Russia. I'm very familiar with -- Russia and China are very much involved in this. In fact, the call for the Federal Reserve to contact the FBI actually came from China because they're the largest holder of prison bonds. Do any of you know that? Maybe. I don't know.

But you were given that information.

You were given the opportunity to actually explore what is going on. The FBI was created as the lawful enforcement arm of the Federal Reserve in specific.

J. Edgar Hoover, who came from a banking family in Switzerland and Germany, aided with the U.S.

Secretary of Treasury Mellon at the time from the Mellon banking family.

I understand that you are going to do whatever you feel based on the factors you deem that are relevant. What I can tell you is that I have given myself, my entirety, using all my skills and capabilities to be able to protect not just my family, but also every single one of you.

I knew it was going to be hard coming in to do this operation. I knew what the attitudes

04:18PM 10

04:18PM 20

2.4

would be. I knew what the comments and the looks and the snickering would be. It's one thing to know it and another to experience it. But it's been worth all of it, because regardless of what happens here today, the truth will come out. New guards will be implemented because the ones that were in place failed.

So I'm going to make it very clear. I don't feel I should be sentenced at all. I don't feel that the jury should have found a conviction; however, I can -- I'm very aware of why they did based on the documentation that was provided, the testimony that was provided and skewed, as well as the lack of data, specific data that would -- that is exculpatory; however, not available to myself or Mr. Beane or any other American person or human being on this planet at this moment.

So, based on those statements, you know, I -- I am innocent. I chose to be here in this moment so that we could have these moments and make them of record.

But when the truth comes out, I will not be the one that's sitting behind bars, let alone if there is any prisons and detention facilities with the human rights abuses that are going on

04:20PM 10

04:20PM 20

inside of those facilities, which are truly human trafficking and human slavery institutions. The largest on the planet is the U.S., second only to Russia, and it's via monetary instruments which are all done through the Clerks of Court to the U.S. Treasury and New York Federal Reserve.

Is that documentation? It's in the hands of the United States, as well as the Federal Reserve. Is it available? Did we have access to it? No. But it will come out. That is eminent.

Because it is, in my opinion, my expertise, in my experience, an injustice when our justice system cannot protect and serve the ones it was created to protect and serve, but, rather, facilitates and benefits foreign actors and a few at the detriment and the violation and the subrogation and the subversion of the other American people and humanity in general because this is not just an American problem.

So everyone that has been involved in this particular case, in this particular sting operation, we all did it with a purpose to be able to make things better, make visible what was wrong, what is wrong so that it could be changed, and we did it lovingly with as much heart and fortitude and

04:21PM 10

04:22PM 20

heartitude as we could.

So I do not hold any grudges, but everyone, including myself, is fully responsible, accountable, and liable for the actions that they have taken, the ignorance that we may possess, the collusion that we may have willingly or unwittingly involved ourselves in, whether on a daily basis or involved in this case in particular.

So I hope the best for everyone as we move forward, but I don't believe that I should have any time at all based on the information I have just stated and based on my statements that I have just made.

Thank you.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you,

Ms. Tucci-Jarraf. You can return to counsel table,

along with Mr. Lloyd, and we'll go ahead and proceed

forward with sentencing.

MS. DAVIDSON: Your Honor, I hate to ask, but might I respond specifically to Mr. Lloyd's statements?

THE COURT: Yes, that would be fine.

MS. DAVIDSON: Your Honor, I want to make very clear to the defendant that this is not a thought prosecution.

04:23PM 10

_ _ _

04:23PM 20

Ms. Tucci-Jarraf committed a crime.

She can believe whatever she wants to, but she cannot violate the laws of the United States, and that's what she has done here.

And she -- when I said that deterrence should be great for her actions because she advocated others commit crimes.

She at every -- she forwarded the Harvey Dent video, which was simple ACH fraud.

She -- every step of the way, she talked to

Mr. Beane. She helped him steal someone else's money through ACH fraud. They didn't take it from the Federal Reserve.

Let's just say that she had said -once the transactions went through, what if she had
said to Mr. Beane, "Don't spend the money. Let's
just wait and make sure that everything is okay
because -- you know, let's make sure it's your
secret account that you got from the Federal
Reserve." But, no, she didn't. She assisted him in
laundering that money and basically getting away
with his crime, and she advocated it at every step
of the way.

If you remember her Facebook post, she says that you all -- and she's meaning the people

04:24PM 10

04:24PM 20

that are following -- are moving faster than my
fingers can type. And you heard from the Federal
Reserve that many others tried to commit this same
ACH fraud that Ms. Tucci-Jarraf was advocating.

And Judge Shirley, during her original

detention hearing, asked her if the Federal Reserve had your money, why didn't you take your own money. And she said she wanted to make sure that everyone else had theirs. So she -- she wasn't in it for the money, but she was advocating others to commit this crime.

This defendant is not unlawfully imprisoned. She is imprisoned by court orders and by the laws of the United States.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

Thank you, again, everyone.

Mr. Lloyd, real quick.

MR. LLOYD: Your Honor, I don't have anything, but under the rule of allocution,

Ms. Tucci-Jarraf is entitled to the last word, as I understand it.

THE COURT: Well, she asked to do her allocution before her argument. But just out of an abundance of caution or given your request -- I mean, I think you've given your allocution, but go

04:25PM 10

04:26PM 20

ahead. If there is anything further you'd like to say on your own behalf before the sentence is imposed.

THE DEFENDANT: She could have done it right after Mr. Lloyd.

THE COURT: Go ahead. If you want to respond to that or otherwise finish your allocution, go ahead.

THE DEFENDANT: This is -- this is a prime example of what we're talking about as far as misleading, misstating, misidentifying.

Again, the testimony stated that all of these actions that were taken by Mr. Beane were actually done -- that they charged him with crimes were actually done before I even spoke with him and the bank and the RV place, the RV dealership.

She would have you believe that I went in and advised Mr. Beane. Anyone who knows me, and it's all a matter of public record, I don't give advisement. In fact, the only advisement I give is that they need to follow with their heart and research.

And when it comes to the Federal

Reserve, on one of the videos that Ms. Davidson

actually put into evidence, myself and other people

04:26PM 10

04:27PM 20

that were involved in the exposés of the corruption in the Federal Reserve and our own government stated, "Do not touch things that you do not know, that you do not understand." Federal Reserve specifically.

04:28PM

04:28PM

I wish our judicial system was actually out for the truth and to make sure that there was a deterrence.

The Federal Reserve is using

Ms. Davidson, our Department of Justice and our FBI

to stop a deterrence of people stopping their

illegal and unlawful activities, and unfortunately

it permeates throughout our entire system.

In one of the filings that I produced there was an affidavit which was listed as an example of how the process works for the Court with the Federal Reserve and Department of Defense and your clerk's ledgers.

By convicting me and giving me as much as you possibly -- possibly can, the Federal Reserve hopes that that will be a deterrence from any other American questioning their abilities, their motives, and whether they're -- whether the people's government is actually operating lawfully and legally; not just here at home domestically, also

overseas.

I'm not someone that watched a video and two months later went to go do something without any kind of investigation at all. In fact, I have been very quiet. This is the first time anybody in this room has ever heard of me was during this case.

I brought bloggers to Morocco because they were investigating banker resignations, financial corruption, reevaluation of currencies, and had basically the same thing that's happening with our DOJ, is being used and abused to influence public knowledge and public opinion, and basically to keep the public dumbed down, dumbed down and scared.

I believe in the government. I believe in law enforcement. But only when it protects and serves the actual people it's supposed to protect and serve. When it's utilized to punish its actual creators from questioning anything and making sure things operate lawfully and legally, harm people not just domestically in our country but also overseas, there is a big problem.

You no longer get to hide behind veils.

You no longer get to hide -- none of us, me

included, none of us get to hide behind any kind of

04:29PM 10

04:30PM 20

quises whatsoever.

We're all operating under our personal responsibility, accountability and liability, and all of our actions from this day, nunc pro tunc from the beginning of this case are all a part of that record and we are held responsible and accountable and liable for that, including what was not presented by the United States, including how the inherent structure of this particular court runs, and that certain factors weren't allowed to be exposed at all regarding the clerk and the process, the monetary process and the conflict of interest.

That information will come out and it will be -- there is nothing that can stop it. In fact, all we've done is hyper-accelerate it today.

Thank you.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

Again, the Court appreciates the defendant's statement, the statements and filings of the parties, either via counsel or directly.

The Court has carefully reviewed the Presentence Report and the entire record in this case and considered the arguments presented by the government and by the defendant, as well as the witness testimony and exhibits, and in a manner

04:31PM 10

04:31PM 20

intended to comply with the Sixth Circuit's jurisprudence since the Booker case rendered the Sentencing Guidelines advisory in Gall v. United States' requirement that the Court make an individual assessment based on the facts presented and adequately explain the chosen sentence, the Court will explain its reasons for the sentence to be imposed in this case.

The Court will discuss the advisory guideline calculation and the factors discussed in 18 United States Code § 3553 relevant to this case.

Based on those factors and consideration of the guideline range, the Court will then impose a sentence sufficient, but not greater than necessary, to comply with the purposes discussed in 18 United States Code § 3553.

The Court has previously referenced that advisory guideline range, and to reiterate, paragraph 62 of the Presentence Report, based on a total offense level of 24 and criminal history category of I, the guideline range is 51 months to 63 months.

Turning next to the 18 United States

Code § 3553 factors, beginning with the nature and

circumstances of the offense, while there has been

04:32PM 10

04:32PM 20

discussion today of whether there has been wrongdoing and innocence versus guilt, the fact remains that the defendant was found guilty of the charges against her, specifically Count 7 in the Indictment, conspiracy to commit money laundering.

Her specific offense conduct, as well as that of her co-conspirator, is set out in some detail beginning at paragraph 6 of the Presentence Report; again, multiple paragraphs therein, which, among other things, summarizes the trial testimony and evidence presented at the trial of Ms. Tucci-Jarraf and Mr. Beane.

The Court takes into consideration all of that trial testimony and evidence and takes into consideration specifically all of the offense conduct as outlined in the Presentence Report as part of its analysis of the nature and circumstances of the offense.

Again, the Court is not going to go through all of that testimony and evidence, but to briefly summarize, again, the defendant was convicted of the count of conspiracy to commit money laundering, among other things, on July 5 and July 7, 2017.

The co-defendant, Mr. Beane, purchased

04:33PM 10

04:34PM 20

or attempted to purchase approximately 40 certificates of deposits totaling over \$38 million from USAA Bank using his Social Security number as the account number and the routing number to the Federal Reserve Bank in New York as the funding account.

At some point on July 5, 2017, the

evidence showed that this defendant,

Ms. Tucci-Jarraf, was corresponding with

co-defendant Beane via Skype, and that she had

knowledge that he was attempting to purchase CDs

using the aforementioned method.

Again, among other things, on July 6, 2017, co-defendant Beane executed a wire transfer of \$493,110.68 to Buddy Gregg Motor Homes for a 45-foot motor home, and once USAA Bank and Whitney Bank, the bank utilized by Buddy Gregg Motor Homes, detected potential fraud regarding Beane's transactions, Beane's accounts were frozen and an investigation was undertaken.

The evidence further showed specifically as to this defendant, among other things, on July 8, July 10 and July 11, this defendant was involved in recorded telephone conversations with Beane and with representatives or

04:35PM

04:35PM 20

employees of Buddy Gregg Motor Homes and Whitney
Bank, and, among other things, she assured all the
parties involved that the transactions were a
legal -- were legal and legitimate, and she further
advised or informed co-defendant Beane as to placing
the motor home in the name of a trust account he had
created using his Social Security number and a
Federal Reserve routing number.

It's noted in the Presentence Report, paragraph 24, that the total loss -- the total intended loss attributed to defendant Beane is no less than \$38,994,960- -- excuse me -- \$38,994,967, and that the total loss attrib- -- total intended loss attributed to defendant Tucci-Jarraf is \$493,110.68.

However, it's noted in the victim impact statement that USAA Bank is a victim in this case and entitled to restitution, but that only defendant Beane is being held responsible for the restitution owed to USAA Bank.

With respect to the history and characteristics of this defendant, the defendant is, I believe, 45 years of age, born in Tacoma, Washington.

She reports being primarily reared by

04:36PM 10

04:37PM 20

her mother and adoptive father.

She -- it's noted that she obtained a bachelor's degree in accounting and a juris doctor degree from Gonzaga University School of Law.

Since approximately 2000, she disclosed that she has been employed as a prosecutor, defense attorney, and private practicing attorney, among other things, stating that she has been, as she indicated here and at trial and to the probation officer, that she has been part of what's been called an operation, a cleanup, or an organization or movement directed to alleged corruption in the banking industry on a national and international basis.

The defendant reports being in relatively good health with no current medical problems, no history of mental or emotional health issues or treatment, and advises that she rarely consumes alcohol and no history of substance abuse or substance abuse treatment, and, again, no previous adult criminal convictions and a criminal history category of I.

With that background in mind, the Court does consider the need for the sentence imposed to reflect various factors under 18 United States

04:37PM 10

04:38PM 20

Code § 3553, one of which is to reflect the seriousness of the offense.

Again, there has been some discussion today as to whether -- as to defendant's guilt or innocence and as to whether she committed any wrongs. That, however, has already been decided earlier this year by a jury in this case.

In fact, as elbow counsel stated earlier, the Court's role today is what sentence is to be imposed as a result of this earlier jury verdict.

More specifically, as the Court stated, the role and purpose of today's sentencing hearing is for the Court to determine a sentence sufficient, but not greater than necessary, to comply with the purposes discussed in 18 United States Code § 3553.

The Court does find this to be serious conduct, given the actions that came forward at trial, given the amounts of monies involved, and given the nature of the crime itself to which the defendant was found guilty by a jury, that being conspiracy to commit money laundering.

The Court also considers the need to promote respect for the law and provide just punishment; again, considering the scope and nature

04:39PM 10

04:39PM

of defendant's offense conduct, also certainly considering and taking into consideration her lack of previous criminal history, as well as all of the statements and allocution, both today and considering defendant's testimony at trial.

The Court also considers and the government specifically asks the Court to consider the need for deterrence, both general deterrence, that is, fashioning a sentence that might act as a general deterrent to others similarly situated to this defendant who may contemplate the undertaking of similar crimes in the future, as well as deterrence specific to this defendant. And certainly that is coupled, somewhat, or could be seen as a corollary to the need to promote respect for the law.

Again, the Court is mindful of the professions of innocence. The Court also notes, even today, the defendant is setting forth that the Court is being asked -- the Court wrote this down as being asked to validate illegal actions not of the defendant but of the prosecution and other actors in the criminal justice system.

So, from that standpoint, the defendant is not expressing any remorse for her criminal

04:40PM 10

04:41PM 20

2.4

conduct and does continue with her assertions of, in fact, the lack of the jurisdiction and the authority of the Court over her.

In that regard, the Court also does consider the discussion of today of thoughts versus actions. Defendant's elbow counsel addressed what he styled as a sincere belief on defendant's part regarding the Federal Reserve system and actions thereof.

However, in this case, I think the proof showed and the jury found that whether we look at, I guess, defendant's positions as sincere beliefs or whether we look at them on the other end as an artifice or some other activity; nonetheless, the proof did show in this case that the defendant went -- what might be styled as one step further or many steps further in taking active steps, as the Court just discussed, with respect to defendant's offense conduct ultimately leading to the jury's verdict in this case that the defendant did violate federal law, 18 United States Code § 1956(h), and did engage in acts, not thoughts, that resulted in the jury's verdict of guilt as to conspiracy to commit money laundering.

The Court also considers the need to

04:42PM 10

04:43PM 20

protect the public from further crimes of the defendant. Again, considering the defendant's offense conduct and also considering her lack of previous criminal history and all the other facts and factors discussed by the Court today.

The Court considers the need to provide the defendant with training, education and medical treatment. The Court does not believe that factor to be relevant in this case, given the defendant's education and training, and given her lack of substance abuse or mental health issues or history.

To the extent that is a factor to consider, the Court would add that it is not intending to and is not imposing or lengthening the defendant's prison sentence to enable her to complete a treatment program or otherwise promote rehabilitation.

The Court also notes under 18 United States Code § 3553 that the advisory guidelines are intended, in part, to carry out the national policies as articulated by Congress that sentences be uniform across the country, to the extent possible, and be based on the offender's actual conduct and history.

Here the government has asked for a

04:43PM 10

04:44PM 20

sentence at the high end of the advisory guidelines. While the defendant did not file any motion related to a request for a sentence outside the advisory guidelines range, she did state in her allocution that she does not think she should be sentenced at all.

I think given the lack of any filings and given just that isolated statement, the Court does not believe that it is presented with a motion for departure or variance; however, to the extent that it is, based on the defendant's allocution and statements today, the Court first would note the distinction between a request for a departure or a variance. A departure referring to the imposition of sentence outside the advisory guidelines range due to the application of a particular guidelines provision. Whereas, a variance refers to the selection of a sentence outside the guidelines range based upon the Court's weighing of one or more of the sentencing factors of § 3553(a).

The Court recognizes its discretion to depart or vary as it deems appropriate; however, in this case, the defendant has not come forward with any -- first with any guidelines provisions for the Court's consideration with respect to any requests

04:45PM 10

04:45PM 20

for a departure, and the Court further, in considering all of the sentencing factors of 18 United States Code § 3553(a), considering the Presentence Report, considering everything that's been presented to the Court today, the Court does not find itself presented with any facts or factors that would take this case outside of the heartland of cases that come before the Court related specifically to the offense conduct of conspiracy to commit money laundering.

So, to the extent the defendant in her allocution or otherwise is asking for a variance, the Court would overrule that request and, again, would note under § 3553 that the advisory guidelines are intended, in part, to carry out the national policy as articulated by Congress that sentences be uniform across the country, to the extent possible, and be based on the offender's actual conduct and history.

There is some difficulty in this case from the standpoint of going back to the 3553 factors with respect to deterrence specifically and to promote respect for the law because the Court's not convinced, based on what it heard at trial and what it heard here today, that any sentence

04:46PM 10

04:47PM 20

necessarily will address adequately the need to afford specific deterrence or to promote respect for the law; again, particularly given the continued professions of innocence and objections to this Court's jurisdiction.

Nonetheless, the Court does believe that deterrence and promotion with respect to the law are appropriate factors for the Court to consider, given the totality of the statements and arguments in this case, and the Court does take those factors particularly into consideration, as well as all the other facts and factors already discussed by the Court, including, but not limited to, the need for the sentence imposed to reflect the seriousness of the offense and to provide just punishment.

So in light of everything discussed, including the guideline range and the relevant 3553 factors, and considering the arguments and position of the parties, the Court first does find the guideline range to be appropriate in this case, and the Court, again, given everything said today and given everything before it, believes that a midrange guideline sentence in this case of 57 months to be a sentence sufficient, but not greater than necessary,

04:47PM 10

04:48PM 20

to comply with the purposes of 18 United States Code § 3553.

The Court is further going to impose, I guess, what would be considered a midrange period of supervised release, again, considering all the facts and factors of 18 U.S.C. § 3553, and the Court will impose a two-year period -- a two-year term of supervised release in this case.

The Court also notes that the

Presentence Report sets forth no special conditions

of supervised release, and the Court would be

imposing only the mandatory and standard conditions

pursuant to the Court's local rules.

Accordingly and pursuant to the Sentencing Reform Act of 1984, it is the judgment of the Court as to Count 7 of the Indictment that the defendant, Heather Ann Tucci-Jarraf, is hereby committed to the custody of the Bureau of Prisons for a term of imprisonment of 57 months.

Upon release from imprisonment, you shall be placed on supervised release for a term of two years.

While on supervised release, you shall not commit another federal, state or local crime.

You must not -- must not unlawfully possess and must

04:49PM 10

04:49PM 20

refrain from use of controlled substances.

You must comply with the standard conditions adopted by this court in Local Rule 83.10. In particular, including but not limited to, you must not own, possess or have access to a firearm, ammunition, destructive device, or dangerous weapon. You shall cooperate in the collection of DNA as directed by the probation officer.

Title 18 U.S.C. §§ 3565(b) and 3583(g) require mandatory revocation of supervised release for possession of a controlled substance, ammunition or firearm or for refusal to comply with drug testing.

However, based on the Court's determination that you pose a low risk of future substance abuse, the Court will suspend the mandatory drug testing condition in this case.

Pursuant to Title 18 U.S.C. § 3013, you shall pay a special assessment fee in the amount of \$100 which shall be due immediately.

The Court finds, upon review of the Presentence Report, you do not have the ability to pay a fine and will waive the fine in this case.

Pursuant to Rule 32 of the Federal

04:50PM 10

04:50PM 20

Rules of Criminal Procedure, the Court advises you may have the right to appeal the sentence imposed in this case. A Notice of Appeal must be filed within 14 days of entry of judgment. If you request and so desire, the Clerk of Court can prepare and file the Notice of Appeal for you.

It's further ordered you be remanded to the custody of the Attorney General pending designation by the Bureau of Prisons.

Ms. Davidson, does the government have any objection to the sentence just pronounced that has not previously been raised?

MS. DAVIDSON: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Ms. Tucci-Jarraf, or you can defer to Mr. Lloyd, but I'll ask you:

Ms. Tucci-Jarraf, do you, as the defendant, have any objection to the sentence just pronounced that has not previously been raised?

objection. It's the same standing that this Court does not have the authority or jurisdiction to sentence me, and I restate that and incorporate every single filing that has been in this case applicable to this particular sentencing that you ordered that you're making, as well as the order for

04:51PM 10

04:51PM 20

- ----

2 as standing documents at the beginning of this proceeding. 3 THE COURT: All right. Thank you. 4 And I'm going to -- I believe either 5 6 based upon Mr. Tucci's testimony and/or it may have 7 been a statement by -- excuse me -- Mr. Jarraf's testimony -- Mr. Jarraf's testimony, and Mr. Lloyd 8 9 may have made a statement as well, but I believe the defendant would like for me to recommend to the 04:52PM 10 11 Bureau of Prisons a designation in the geographic 12 area of Boston, Massachusetts. MR. LLOYD: Correct, Your Honor. 13 14 THE COURT: Again, the Court will make that recommendation without objection. Keeping in mind 15 16 that that is a recommendation to the Bureau of 17 Prisons and the ultimate designation is up to the 18 Bureau of Prisons. All right. Anything further from 19 04:52PM 20 either party at this point? The government? 21 MS. DAVIDSON: No, Your Honor. THE COURT: Or the defendant? 22 23 MR. LLOYD: Your Honor, the defendant does 24 ask the Clerk to file a Notice of Appeal as to the 25 Judgment of Conviction and the sentence.

null and void all of the documents which I have put

| | 10 |
|----|---|
| 1 | THE COURT: All right. The Court will |
| 2 | direct the Clerk at the defendant's request to do |
| 3 | so. |
| 4 | All right. Thank you, everyone, for |
| 5 | being here this afternoon, and we'll stand |
| 6 | adjourned. |
| 7 | THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: All rise. This |
| 8 | honorable court should stand adjourned. |
| 9 | (Which were all the proceedings |
| 10 | had and herein transcribed.) |
| 11 | * * * * * |
| 12 | |
| 13 | |
| 14 | |
| 15 | |
| 16 | |
| 17 | |
| 18 | |
| 19 | |
| 20 | |
| 21 | |
| 22 | |
| 23 | |
| 24 | |
| 25 | |
| | |

1 C-E-R-T-I-F-I-C-A-T-E2 STATE OF TENNESSEE 3 COUNTY OF KNOX I, Teresa S. Grandchamp, RMR, CRR, do hereby 4 5 certify that I reported in machine shorthand the 6 above proceedings; that the foregoing pages were 7 transcribed under my personal supervision and 8 constitute a true and accurate record of the 9 proceedings. 10 I further certify that I am not an attorney 11 or counsel of any of the parties, nor an employee or 12 relative of any attorney or counsel connected with the action, nor financially interested in the 13 14 action. 15 Transcript completed and signed on Wednesday, 16 August 1, 2018. 17 18 19 TERESA S. GRANDCHAMP, RMR, CRR 20 Official Court Reporter 21 22 23 2.4